



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/031,426	01/18/2002	Chikara Kami	1012-02	6444

35811 7590 09/08/2004

IP DEPARTMENT OF PIPER RUDNICK LLP
ONE LIBERTY PLACE, SUITE 4900
1650 MARKET ST
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103

EXAMINER

YEE, DEBORAH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1742

DATE MAILED: 09/08/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/031,426

Applicant(s)

KAMI ET AL.

Examiner

Deborah Yee

Art Unit

1742

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 17 June 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 13-15, 17, 18, 21 and 22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 17, 18, 21 and 22 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8 and 13-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 18 January 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☒ None of:
- 1) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3) ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 6-17-04.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after allowance or after an Office action under *Ex Parte Quayle*, 25 USPQ 74, 453 O.G. 213 (Comm'r Pat. 1935). Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, prosecution in this application has been reopened pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on June 17, 2004 has been entered.

Double Patenting

2. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 1-7 and 13 -15 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 -3 of U.S. Patent No. 6,702,904. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because they both disclose high tensile strength cold rolled steel sheets having excellent strain age hardening

Art Unit: 1742

characteristics and compositions with overlapping alloy wt% ranges. More specifically, pending claims recite the amount of dissolve N being 0.001% or more which would be equivalent to 0.001% or more of N in a solid solution state, since "dissolve" is the same "solid solution".

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1 to 3, 5 to 8, 13, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over European patent 943696 cited in IDS dated June 17, 2004.

6. Ep'696 discloses a cold rolled steel paragraph 19 having a composition with alloying constituents whose wt% ranges overlap those recited by the claims; such overlap renders applicant's composition prima facie obvious because it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to select the claimed range from the broader disclosure of the prior art because the prior art has similar properties of high temperature strength, toughness, bake hardening, and drawability.

7. More specifically, note alloy J composition in Tables 6 and 8 meets the recited claims except for 0.035% Al which is slightly outside applicant's claimed range of 0.005 to 0.03%. It is the examiner's position that it would be obvious to

Art Unit: 1742

have lower Al amounts since a broad Al range of 0.001 to 0.150% is taught.

Moreover, applicant has not demonstrated (e.g. by comparative test data) that the more narrowly claimed Al range is somehow critical or productive of new and unexpected. Hence claims would not patentably distinguish over prior art.

Moreover, note that alloy J when calculated, has N/Al of 0.3143 and a solute N content of 0.0055.

8. Although the BH, Δ TS, strength, and r values recited in claims 17, 13 and 15, such would be expected since compositional and process limitation of cold working are closely met, and in absence of proof to the contrary.

9. Lines 54-55 in paragraph 19 discloses a ferritic microstructure wherein the mean grain size is not larger than 10 microns which would satisfy claim 6.

10. Lines 5-6 in paragraph 58 discloses steel sheet can be galvanized and hence meet claim 8.

Allowable Subject Matter

11. Claims 17 to 22 are allowed.

12. The following is an examiner's statement of reasons for allowance: The art of record does not teach or fairly suggest the high tensile strength cold-rolled steel sheet composition, as claimed, having a high r value and excellent strain age hardenability and natural aging resistance, and having structure of ferrite phase having an average crystal grain diameter of 10 microns or less at an area ratio of 80% or more and a martensite phase as a second phase at an area ratio of 2% or more and the r value at 1.2 or more; or a structure composed of an acicular ferrite phase at an area ratio of 5% or more and a ferrite phase having

Art Unit: 1742

an average crystal grain diameter of 20 microns or less and the r value at 1.2 or more.

Any comments considered necessary by applicant must be submitted no later than the payment of the issue fee and, to avoid processing delays, should preferably accompany the issue fee. Such submissions should be clearly labeled "Comments on Statement of Reasons for Allowance."

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Deborah Yee whose telephone number is 571-272-1253. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 6:00 to 2:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King can be reached on 571-272-1244. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


DEBORAH YEE
PRIMARY EXAMINER